

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of August 31, 2010 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 9, 11, 17, 19-23, 25, and 26 have been amended. Claim 31 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 32 has been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19-27, and 32 will be pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Van Handel for the courtesies extended to its representative during the telephonic Examiner Interview of November 3, 2010. The following remarks include Applicants' substance of the interview pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19-27 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to remove the recitation to a database containing "full" program titles. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 17, 21-23, 25 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548 to Davis, et al. ("Davis") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,383 to Fleischer ("Fleischer").

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,279,018 to Kudrolli, et al. ("Kudrolli").

Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,981,217 to Knauff, et al. ("Knauff").

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, further in view of Kudrolli, and still further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,374,225 to Hejna, Jr. (“Hejna”).

Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,169,543 to Wehmeyer (“Wehmeyer”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As generally discussed with the Examiner, amended claim 1 recites, among other features, “transmitting the abbreviated program title to a client device; transmitting the original program title to the client device; and transmitting instructions for displaying the abbreviated program title interchangeably with the original program title in a program title field of the electronic program guide at a first location.” The combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach or suggest transmitting *both the abbreviated program title and original program title* to a client device and transmitting instructions for displaying the abbreviated program title *interchangeably with the original program title in a first location*, as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Davis and Fleischer.

Amended independent claims 9 and 17 recite substantially similar features as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 9 and 17 are allowable over the combination of Davis and Fleischer for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 21-23 and 25 depend from claim 9 or 17 and are therefore allowable over the combination of Davis and Fleischer for at least the same reasons as their base claims.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19, and 20 depend from claim 1, 9 or 17. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach all of the features of claims 1, 9, and 17. The addition of Kudrolli fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claims 1, 9 and 17. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19, and 20 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Kudrolli.

Claims 6 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 9, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 9. The addition of Knauff fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and

Fleischer with respect to claims 1 and 9. Thus, claims 6 and 14 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Knauff.

Claims 7 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. As discussed above, the combination of Davis, Fleischer and Kudrolli fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 9. The addition of Hejna fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis, Fleischer, and Kudrolli with respect to claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 7 and 15 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, Kudrolli, and Hejna.

Claims 24, 26 and 27 depend from claim 17. As discussed above with respect to claim 17, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 17. The addition of Wehmeyer fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claim 17. Accordingly, claims 24, 26 and 27 are allowable over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Wehmeyer for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

New Claim

New claim 32 has been added. Illustrative, non-limiting support for claim 32 can be found throughout the specification as filed and specifically in paragraph 20.

Claim 32 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, the art of record fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, as generally discussed with the Examiner, claim 32 recites, “transmitting instructions for transitioning the display between the abbreviated program title and the original program title upon receipt of a zoom command.” The art of record fails to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over the art of record for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: November 30, 2010

By: /Stephanie L. Roberts/
Stephanie L. Roberts
Registration No. 62,473

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001